Case 1:21-cv-06319-JGK Document 25 Filed 10/14/21 Page 1 of 2 Case 1:21-cv-06319-JGK Document 23 Filed 10/14/21 Page 1 of 2

JONES DAY

250 VESEY STREET • NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10281.1047 TELEPHONE: +1.212.326.3939 • FACSIMILE: +1.212.755.7306

DIRECT NUMBER: (212) 326-8338

October 14, 2021

CM/ECF

The Honorable John G. Koeltl United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl St. New York, NY 10007

Re:

Koeltl parties should talk teach more court before writing to the Court. The Court wyork before writing to the Court along about alges with peet any disjustes about reductions at this point.

Chandler v. International Business Machines Corporation, No. 1:21-cv-

06319-JGK

Dear Judge Koeltl:

On behalf of Defendant International Business Machines Corp. ("IBM"), I write to respond to Plaintiff's October 13, 2021 letter (ECF No. 22). IBM does not dispute that it would be appropriate for the Court, consistent with Judge Furman's modified ruling, see In re: IBM Arbitration Agreement Litigation, No. 1:21-cv-06296 (JMF), at ECF No. 36, to revert to its original order (ECF No. 18) granting Plaintiff's application to seal the summary judgment filings provided that copies of the documents with the allegedly confidential material redacted should be filed in the public docket. IBM notes, however, that in filing this most recent motion (ECF No. 22), Plaintiff yet again did not meet and confer with IBM before seeking relief from the Court. As we pointed out previously, Plaintiff likewise failed to meet and confer with IBM on sealing and redaction in advance of filing his summary judgment motion in the first place. (See Individual Practices Section VI.)

To ensure appropriate conferral takes place regarding redacting and sealing issues, IBM requests that the Court order (i) the parties to meet and confer on sealing and redaction of the summary judgment filings, (ii) that no party may file in the public record any material as to which there is a dispute about sealing and redaction until the Court resolves such dispute, and (iii) that in the event of a dispute, the party claiming confidentiality must submit a letter to the Court to justify its position within 3 business days after a live telephone meet-and-confer call on these issues.

JONES DAY

Hon. John G. Koeltl October 14, 2021 Page 2

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew W. Lampe

Matthew W. Lampe

cc: Shannon Liss-Riordan, Esq.